DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 570 CS 213 527

AUTHOR Lain, Laurence B.
TITLE A National Study of High School Newspaper Programs: Environmental and Adviser Characteristics, Funding and Pressures on Free Expression.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (75th, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, August 5-8, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Censorship; *Financial Support; *Freedom of Speech; *High Schools; Journalism; National Surveys; *School Newspapers; *Student Publications
IDENTIFIERS *Advisor Role; Journalism Research; *Scholastic Journalism

ABSTRACT

A study examined school, publication, and adviser characteristics most often associated with certain types of autonomy found in high school newspaper programs. From a compilation of all high schools in the United States, 434 schools were selected at random. Each school was sent a coded questionnaire concerning the school, the newspaper (if the school had one), who approved copy prior to publication, and the educational, professional, and advising experience of the advisers. Two hundred and thirty questionnaires were returned, for a response rate of 53%. Results indicated that: (1) adviser characteristics (notably experience and affiliation with professional associations) were clearly associated with newspaper autonomy; (2) papers supported through advertising were better able to run stories on birth control, abortion, sex, and stories critical of school administration; (3) papers which made a profit were less likely to be screened by administrators; and (4) profitable papers had fewer stories killed by administrators and were less likely to allow teachers to screen stories about themselves. Findings suggest that journalism teachers should place greater emphasis on teaching about the economics of newspapers, as well as about their editorial operations, and that advisers concerned about free expression should carefully consider the role of administrative subsidies for the papers they advise. (Three tables of data and 18 notes are included; the questionnaire is attached.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349570

A NATIONAL STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL NEWSPAPER PROGRAMS: ENVIRONMENTAL AND ADVISER CHARACTERISTICS, FUNDING AND PRESSURES ON FREE EXPRESSION

by

Laurence B. Lain, Ph.D.

Department of Communication

University of Dayton

Submitted to the Secondary Education Division of the
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
Annual Convention, Montreal, PQ, Canada, August 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Laurence B. Lain

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Department of Communication
University of Dayton
Dayton, OH 45469-1410
phone: (513) 229-2028
fax: (513) 229-4000
email: Lain@Dayton.bitnet
Lain@udavxb.oca.udayton.edu.internet

CS213527

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A NATIONAL STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL NEWSPAPER PROGRAMS: ENVIRONMENTAL AND ADVISER CHARACTERISTICS, FUNDING AND PRESSURES ON FREE EXPRESSION

INTRODUCTION

It has been nearly twenty years since The Commission of Inquiry into High School Journalism produced its classic report Captive Voices[1] which detailed the pressures of control and censorship to which America's high school journalists were subjected. While the report was frequently criticized even by strong advocates of scholastic press freedom for what were sometimes called its "sweeping generalizations and over-simplification,"[2] it raised the level of sensitivity of educators throughout the country to the role and problems of the high school press.

In 1969 the Supreme Court of the United States had ruled that school officials could not prevent students from wearing armbands as a means of protest unless the officials could demonstrate that the expression presented a clear and present danger of the serious disruption of the school[3]. This decision was, for most of the next generation, applied in various ways to the scholastic press. Student journalists were, of course, still subject to pressure from administrators, teachers, and even their own advisers, but when the occasional legal showdowns came, they could have some reasonable confidence that the law was on their

side. The establishment of the Student Press Law Center in Washington, D.C., in 1974 provided a clearinghouse for information and legal advice and support for scholastic and collegiate journalists.

Between Tinker in 1969 and Hazelwood in 1988[4] scores of cases concerning student press rights entered the legal system. Some were resolved out of court, and of those which were adjudicated, student journalists found themselves winning more than they lost. But since the Supreme Court upheld a Missouri principal's right to control the content of his school's newspaper in Hazelwood, an awareness has grown that the battle for freedom of expression on scholastic publications must turn increasingly from the courtroom to the classroom. What the courts are now reluctant to grant as a constitutional right in a single judgment must perhaps be won now in individual school districts, working inside the school system rather than inside the legal system.

That is the battle for which this paper attempts to help lay the groundwork. If it is possible to increase our understanding of the factors which appear to promote higher levels of autonomy in high school publications, it may, by encouraging the development of those factors, assist in the battle to foster a freer student press. While it may not be possible to do much about the environmental factors under which school newspapers

operate, e.g. school and community size, public or private, etc., many elements are subject to influence. How school newspapers are funded, how advisers are hired, trained and compensated: these and other factors can be studied and over time modified in directions which appear consistent with higher levels of free expression.

Many of these elements appear repeatedly in the literature. Campbell[5] recognized in 1939 that few high school newspaper advisers had adequate backgrounds in journalism and the college courses they had taken had little to do with their advising responsibilities. Boyd[6] reported in 1960 that journalism teachers in Indiana were seldom hired specifically for the job and had little training in the field. Pettibone[7] said much the same thing ten years later. Driscoll[8] emphasizes the importance of scholastic press and advisers' organizations to the school publication program and a special issue of the NASSP Bulletin provides a series of articles designed to help principals hire, train and keep effective advisers.[9] A 1980 study by Trager and Dickerson[10] points up the lack of a consistent approach to high school journalists but affirms the importance of community size. Gallinger provides recent information on levels of cooperation between the scholastic and the commercial press.[11]

Most of the literature is based on state or regional studies. National samples are less common. But Click and

Kopenhaver provide excellent national information on principals' attitudes toward student press freedom immediately prior to the Hazelwood decision, and include good demographic data about many characteristics of the scholastic press nationally.[12] Most of Dickson's recent work has dealt with the immediate post-Hazelwood era and provides valuable attitudinal and demographic information from national samples about the high school press.[13]

While studies involving adviser or community characteristics are not uncommon, there has been little investigation of the role, if any, played by funding of the scholastic press in questions of free expression. Descriptive studies dealing wholly or partly with the financial bases of the school press have been done by Benedict,[14] Dvorak,[15] and Lain.[16]

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

This paper represents an attempt to identify school, publication and adviser characteristics most often associated with certain types autonomy found in high school newspaper programs. The word "autonomy" is used here not to suggest a wholly independent press, accountable to no one, but a press which is responsible for making its own decisions about content and coverage, free of prior review by school authorities.

Four categories of variables were considered. Environmental variables were those which described the general nature of the school, community, and newspaper; Financial variables measured the extent to which the paper relied on various sources of funding and on its recent financial health; Adviser variables categorized adviser backgrounds and professional affiliations; and Autonomy variables described some of the roles of staff, advisers, and school officials in establishing the content of the paper. In general, environmental, financial and adviser variables were considered independent or antecedent variables with autonomy variables considered as dependent or criterion variables.

METHOD

From a compilation of all high schools in the United States,[17] 434 schools were selected using a skip interval technique with a random start point.

Each school in the sample was sent a coded questionnaire and postage-paid reply envelope during the winter of 1990-91. Mailings were addressed to "Newspaper Adviser or Principal" and recipients were requested to return the instrument even if there was no newspaper at the school. After three weeks a second copy of the instrument and reply envelope were sent to schools which had not responded to the first mailing.

The 38-item questionnaire consisted of four sections. Part One asked for information about the school and community, particularly the public or non-public nature of the school, its enrollment in grades 10-12, and the size of the community in which it was located. Respondents were also asked whether the school published a student newspaper. Those schools which did not were requested to return the instrument while others were told to procede with the rest of the questions.

Part Two asked a number of questions about the newspaper itself: its frequency of publication, credit or extracurricular nature of its staff, printing method, extent of computer usage, annual budget, financial health, and sources of operating funds.

Part Three asked advisers who besides staff members read or approved copy prior to publication, how often that was done, whether some articles were killed in this process and how often, and what the role of school administration was in naming the newspaper's editor. This section also sought information on the sorts of stories the paper could or could not run through reaction to a catalogue of ten story subjects. Part Four of the instrument collected information about the educational, professional, and advising experience of the advisers, how they acquired their jobs, their pay, and their membership in professional associations.

RESULTS

I. General Characteristics

Of the 434 questionnaires mailed, 230 were returned, a response rate of 53 per cent. Of the 230 respondents, 198, or 86 per cent, were public schools while 32, or 14 per cent, were non-public. Schools of 250 or fewer students accounted for 22.8 per cent of the total, schools enrolling 251 to 500 students also accounted for 22.8 per cent, schools enrolling 501 to 1,000 students represented 32.9 per cent of the respondents, and schools of more than 1,000 students accounted for 21.4 per cent. Median school size was 595.

More than 35 per cent of the schools responding were in rural areas while another 27 per cent were located in towns of less than 25,000. Schools in communities of 25,000 to 100,000 accounted for 16 per cent of the total, and those in cities of more than 100,000 accounted for 21 per cent or respondents.

About 85 per cent of the schools, 195 in all, reported publishing newspapers; the remaining analysis refers only to these 195 schools. In addition, further analysis will be limited largely to those variables identified in the preceding section as prospective antecedent and criterion variables. A fuller descriptive analysis of the demographics and other variables in this study are available in an earlier paper.[18]

II. Environmental Variables

Five environmental variables were studied:

* Type of school: public or non-public,
* Enrollment in grades 10-12,
* Size of the community in which the school was located,
* Frequency of publication of the newspaper,
* Whether the staff receives academic credit, works in a non-credit class, or is extracurricular.

As noted, about 85 per cent of the schools responding to the survey reported publishing newspapers, and the profile of those which published were not strikingly different from those with no newspaper. About 86 per cent of the public schools published newspapers and 77 per cent of the non-public schools did so. Larger schools were much more likely to publish newspapers than were smaller schools. Nearly 98 per cent of the schools of more than 1,000 students had a paper while only 67 per cent of those with 250 or fewer students did so. Community size of those schools publishing papers closely reflected community size in the overall sample.

By far the most common publication cycle is monthly: just over 50 per cent of respondents. Frequency of publication varied little by size and type of school. Eighty per cent of the

schools gave academic credit for work on the paper, with public schools being somewhat more likely to do so.

III. Financial Variables

Three general characteristics comprising seven variables were included as Financial variables:

* The annual budget for the publication,
* Whether the paper made or lost money last year,
* The percentage of its annual budget deriving from
    - Activity Fees paid by all students
    - Subscription Sales
    - Single Copy Sales
    - Direct Administrative Subsidy
    - Advertising.

Median annual budget was $2,085 with greatest differences attributable to school size (X^2=42.42 with 12 df, $p<.001$). About 55 per cent of schools reported breaking even financially the previous year; a quarter made money and 20 per cent lost money on the paper.

About 20 per cent of the schools received money from student activity fees, but it was an important revenue source for relatively few. Even fewer schools, less than 9 per cent, sold subscriptions at all, and only five schools used such monies for as much as half their income. About a quarter of the schools

relied somewhat on single copy sales, with differences among school sizes and types not significant. Smaller schools were somewhat more likely to derive a major share of their income from administrative subsidy ($R=-.25$, $p<.001$) and larger schools were more likely to rely more heavily on advertising in their budgets ($R=.29$, $p<.001$).

IV. Adviser Variables

Seven variables were used to study adviser background and activity:

* Advisers' compensation for work with the paper
* Major field for undergraduate degree
* Major field for graduate degree, if any
* How they became responsible for the newspaper, i.e., hired for the job, assigned the job after being hired for another teaching position, or volunteered for the role
* Years of advising experience
* Type and duration of any college, part-time, or full-time professional journalism experience

* Membership for themselves or their staffs in the following journalism organizations: local, state or regional associations, JEA, CSPAA, Quill & Scroll, NSPA, CSPA, AEJMC, Society of Professional Journalists, Kappa Tau Alpha.

Two-thirds of newspaper advisers in the study were paid for their work, with the median compensation being $450. Larger schools paid more ($R=.38$, $p<.0001$) as did public schools ($R=.24$, $p<.0001$). Most advisers had B.A.'s in English: nearly 60 per cent. About 12 per cent had journalism degrees. Exactly half had master's degrees, usually in education (21 per cent) or English (15 per cent). Not quite 6 per cent had graduate degrees in journalism.

About 37 per cent of advisers had been hired for their jobs; the rest were evenly divided between those who volunteered or were assigned the position after hiring. Larger schools were more likely to hire advisers for the job; smaller schools more often assigned existing staff members to the task ($X^2=20.34$ with 9 df, $p<.02$). Public schools were also more likely to hire advisers than to appoint them ($X^2=11.17$ with 3 df, $p<.02$). Ten per cent of the advisers were in their first year on the job and more than one-third had three years or less of advising experience. Median experience was 5.0 years, but one-fourth had more than ten years experience. Only five per cent of advisers

had had a year or more of full-time professional newspaper work, but 20 per cent had worked at least part-time after college. More than 60 per cent, however, had never worked for a newspaper of any sort during college or later years. There were no significant differences among different types or sizes of schools in the amount of advising or journalism experience possessed by their newspaper advisers.

Nearly one-third of the newspaper advisers in the study belonged to no adviser or student journalism associations. About a quarter belonged to one organization, a like number belonged to two or three, and 17 per cent belonged to four or more. A bit over half belonged to a local, state, or regional press association, 38 per cent were Quill & Scroll members, 28 per cent belonged to JEA, 17 per cent to CSPA, 15 per cent to CSPAA, 13 per cent to NSPA, less than 3 per cent to SPJ, and 1 per cent each to AEJMC or KTA. Advisers at larger schools were much more likely to be involved in professional associations, and to belong to more of them ($R=.45$, $p<.00001$)

V. Autonomy Variables

Seventeen questions were asked of respondents which sought to determine some of the constraints under which their staffs operated. Those questions were of two general types.

First, seven questions were asked about who influenced the editorial process:

* How often an administrator reads copy for the newspaper before publication;
* Whether potentially-controversial articles must be cleared with administration before publication;
* How often an administrator has killed an article before publication;
* How often the adviser reads copy for the newspaper before publication;
* How often the adviser has killed an article or required a rewrite for reasons of content, not for mechanical reasons;
* Whether teachers are permitted to review articles about themselves or their organizations before publication, and what changes they may make;
* Whether the principal must select or approve the choice of the newspaper editor.

Next, respondents were given ten general story types and asked whether each would definitely or probably be killed by the principal, would definitely or probably be killed by the adviser, probably would run in the school's newspaper, or that a similar story had run in the paper in the previous year. Respondents were told to evaluate only by subject matter and to assume that

the pieces were otherwise well-written and researched. The story types were:

* Birth Control
* Abortion
* Endorsement of a candidate for local office
* Endorsement of a candidate for school board
* Story critical of the school board
* Story critical of school administration
* Story critical of a school sports team
* Story critical of teachers in general
* Drug problems in your school
* General story about teen, sex and pregnancy.

A. Influencing the Editorial Process

There were some differences on most of the Autonomy variables which could be statistically associated with certain of the Environmental, Financial or Adviser variables. This section reports those differences on the first type of Autonomy variables, those bearing on who screens or otherwise influences the editorial process. Table 1 reports the percentages of principals and advisers who read copy before publication and how frequently they kill copy.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Principals never screen copy for the paper at 44 per cent of the schools responding, but always do so at 14.5 per cent of the schools. About a third do so only on request of the advisers. Newspapers which lost money the previous year were more likely to have their papers screened by administrators (X^2=17.08 with 8 df, $p<.05$). Papers which had made a profit the previous year were less likely to have stories killed by administrators (X^2=16.68 with 8 df, $p<.05$) and were less likely to permit teachers to review stories about themselves or their organizations before publication (X^2=12.71 with 4 df, $p<.01$). More experienced advisers were less likely to have their papers screened by the principal (X^2=34.62 with 16 df, $p<.01$).

About one-third of principals require that controversial articles be cleared with them prior to publication. More experienced advisers were less likely to have such a requirement in their schools (X^2=20.24 with 4 df, $p<.001$).

Two-thirds of advisers reported that their principals had never killed a story. A quarter said it happened rarely, and just 7 per cent said it happened sometimes or often. Papers whose advisers had no college or professional experience in

journalism were more likely to have stories killed by the principal (X^2=28.95 with 12 df, p<.01).

Other teachers are never permitted to review stories about themselves or their organizations at 41 per cent of the schools reporting. At 42 per cent they may review stories for facts only, and at 17 per cent they may require changes in any content. Papers which rely most heavily on single copy sales are most likely to allow teachers to approve stories about themselves (X^2=19.35 with 10 df, p<.05), as are papers which lost money the previous year (X^2=12.71 with 4 df, p<.01). Advisers' activity in professional organizations was also significant, with more active advisers less often permitting teachers access to the stories (X^2=16.24 with 6 df, p<.01). Membership in JEA, CSPAA, NSPA and CSPA were all significant the .05 level or less.

The numbers of papers on which advisers did <u>not</u> read copy before publication, or on which principals either chose or approved the choice of editor, were very small, less than 3 per cent total, and were not used in further analyses.

B. Publication of General Story Types

Story types were similar to many of those used in other national studies cited earlier. All were controversial and even those <u>most</u> likely to run would be killed at 14 per cent of

respondents' schools. Six of the ten stories would be killed at more than one-third of the schools simply because of their subject matter, as the instrument stipulated that the stories should be considered well written and researched. Table 2 reports the percentage of schools reporting that each story will be killed by the principal, by the adviser, or that would run.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

---

1. BIRTH CONTROL

More than 30 per cent of respondents said this story would probably by killed by either the adviser or the principal. Private schools (mostly church-supported) would be significantly less likely to run such a story (X^2=14.91 with 5 df, $p<.01$), as would smaller schools (X^2=30.86 with 15 df, $p<.01$). Staffs which receive academic credit for their work are more likely to be able to run such a story (X^2=21.79 with 10 df, $p<.02$). Furthermore, newspapers which pay more of their own expenses through advertising sales are more likely to be able to run such a story (X^2=40.92 with 25 df, $p<.02$). Adviser experience also matters: papers with more experienced advisers are better able to run such a story (X^2=40.88 with 20 df, $p<.01$).

2. ABORTION

Over a quarter of the schools indicated that any abortion story would definitely or probably be killed. Private schools would more often forbid such a story (X^2=15.91 with 5 df, $p<.01$), but papers generating more advertising revenue are more likely than others to be able to run the story (X^2=48.61 with 25 df, $p<.01$). Papers whose advisers were hired for the position were more likely to run the story than papers advised by appointees or volunteers (X^2=25.59 with 15 df, $p<.05$) as were papers whose advisers are active in associations (X^2=25.57 with 15 df, $p<.05$), particularly state groups, Quill & Scroll and JEA, all significant at at least .01.

3. POLITICAL ENDORSEMENTS

Endorsements of candidates for local office is apparently a dangerous subject: such a story would be killed at nearly half the schools responding. Papers whose advisers are active in professional associations are somewhat more likely to run such endorsements (X^2=26.25 with 15 df, $p<.05$).

4. SCHOOL BOARD ENDORSEMENTS

This was the story most likely to be killed; almost 59 per cent of the schools in the study would forbid its publication.

None of the antecedent variables was statistically associated with this variable.

5. STORY CRITICAL OF THE SCHOOL BOARD

About 40 per cent of respondents said this story would probably be killed. However, it would be more likely to be run in the school of an adviser active in professional associations (X^2=26.27 with 15 df, $p<.05$).

6. STORY CRITICAL OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Here, too, more than 39 per cent of advisers said such a story could not run in their papers. But there are more variables associated with those schools where the story would run. Papers which bring in more advertising revenue would be more likely to run it (X^2=43.47 with 25 df, $p<.01$), as would schools where advisers are better paid for their work (X^2=27.50 with 15 df, $p<.02$). Schools whose adviser has a bachelor's degree in journalism, education or social science appear more able to run a story critical of school administration (X^2=72.07 with 40 df, $p<.001$), as do schools whose adviser has a master's degree in any field (X^2=60.84 with 40 df, $p<.02$). Schools with advisers who belong to professional associations are also better able to run this story(X^2=33.93 with 15 df, $p<.01$).

7. STORY CRITICAL OF A SPORTS TEAM

Both because criticism of other students is often considered inappropriate and because sports programs are sacred cows in many places, stories which criticize athletic teams are relatively rare. More than 38 per cent of the respondents said such a story could not run in their newspapers. But advisers with B.A.'s in journalism report that they are more likely to be able to do so (X^2=57.16 with 40 df, $p<.05$), as do advisers who have had college-level or better experience in journalism themselves (X^2=28.21 with 15 df, $p<.02$). Advisers active in professional associations are also more likely to have papers that can run such stories (X^2=28.79 with 1 df, $p<.02$).

8. STORY CRITICAL OF TEACHERS IN GENERAL

As Table 2 shows, principals may not have as much trouble with the student newspaper criticizing teachers as the adviser does. This story could not run in nearly 43 per cent of the schools in the study, with advisers reporting that they would be about three times more likely to kill the story than the principal would be. Two variables are associated with this story. Advisers who are paid more for their publications work are <u>less</u> likely than others to have a paper which would run the story (X^2=28.19 with 15 df, $p<.02$), but advisers who are active

in professional associations are more often associated with paper which would run the story (X^2=29.46 with 15 df, p<.01).

9. STORY ABOUT DRUG PROBLEMS IN YOUR SCHOOL

This sort of story is seldom a problem any longer: about 14 per cent of the respondents said such a story would not be permitted in their papers. Only two variables were significantly associated with this story: Advisers who were hired for the job were more likely to see it run in their papers than were appointees or volunteers (X^2=34.27 with 15 df, p<.01), as were advisers active in professional associations (X^2=30.01 with 15 df, p<.01).

10. STORY ABOUT TEENS, SEX AND PREGNANCY

Stories like this have become almost routine; just 14 per cent of the papers in the study do not permit them. Papers which generate more advertising dollars are more likely to be able to run this story (X^2=43.97 with 25 df, p<.01), but papers which rely more heavily on administration subsidies are less likely to run it (X^2=37.44 with 25 df, p<.05). Papers whose adviser has an undergraduate degree in journalism or education are more likely to run the story (X^2=69.48 with 40 df, p<.01), as are papers whose advisers were hired specifically for the job (X^2=37.21 with 15 df, p<.001). The newspapers of more experienced advisers are

more likely to run such a story (X^2=31.87 with 20 df, $p<.05$), as were those whose advisers belong to professional associations (X^2=27.75 with 15 df, $p<.02$).

DISCUSSION

The influence of such factors as school type and size, and as an adviser's experience and memberships held have long been understood as important elements in the degree to which their student journalists enjoy a high degree of free expression. More experienced advisers in this study were less likely to have their newspapers' copy reviewed by administrators before publication and less likely to be required to seek clearance before running controversial articles. Stories about birth control were more likely to run in their papers.

Advisers who were active in professional associations were less likely than others to allow other teachers to screen stories about themselves or their organizations before publication, and their papers were more likely to run eight of the ten hypothetical stories; only stories on birth control and endorsements for school board candidates did not covary with membership in organizations.

Aside from experience and affiliation, a few other adviser characteristics were important in some features of the study. Whether advisers were hired for their jobs or obtained them in some other way was related to the ability of their papers to publish articles on abortion, drugs and sex. The degree they held and its major field were associated with their papers'

publication of stories about sex and critical of administration and athletics. And the extent of practical experience they had had in journalism was related to the publication of criticism of athletics and with the frequency with which stories were killed by administrators.

But the data presented in the previous section also suggest the influence of newspaper finances in providing the publication with as much autonomy as possible. Papers which supported themselves largely through advertising were more likely to be able to run stories on birth control, abortion, sex and pregnancy, and stories which were critical of school administration. Moreover, papers which had made a profit the previous school year were less likely than others to be screened by administrators before publication. Profit-generating papers were less likely to have stories killed by administrators before publication and they were less likely to allow teachers to screen stories about themselves.

Table 3 demonstrates the extent to which advertising is more likely to produce a profit-making newspaper than is administrative subsidy. Among newspapers which take in half or more of their revenues from advertising, 42 per cent make a profit and only 19 per cent lose money, while papers which collect half or more of their budgets from administrators are as likely to lost money as not. Among papers which finance

themselves entirely through advertising, 68 per cent make a profit and just 11 per cent lose money. Administrative subsidies at that level allow most papers to break even but not, of course, to make a profit.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Across the sample, level of advertising support was strongly associated with a newspaper's ability to make a profit (X^2=31.21 with 10 df, $p<.001$).

IMPLICATIONS

Three fronts are already well understood as those on which the battle for freedom of expression for America's high school journalists must be fought. The shock troops are those fighting the legal battles to minimize the damage caused by the Hazelwood precident and the decisions which will ultimately be based on it.

Also important to the future strength of scholastic journalism is increasing the professional involvement of advisers. This study is merely the most recent documentation of the leadership provided by state, regional and national press associations in educating and assisting their members. Where advisers and staffs are involved with their colleagues elsewhere, strong and active programs are all the more likely. It must

remain high on the agendas of those organizations to attract and involve as many schools as possible.

Adviser characteristics are, of course, central to the success of scholastic journalism programs. Adivsers with appropriate degrees and journalistic experience can provide their students with sound training in the professional, legal and ethical issues which confront them. Few school systems would consider hiring a football coach or band director who had no background in sports or music; but less than 37 per cent of the newspaper advisers in this study were hired specifically for the job. Thirty-one per cent volunteered and 32 per cent were given no choice: they were simply assigned the job. Greater effort must be made by teacher groups and press associations to persuade school officials that this is no more appropriate to do in journalism than it is in sports or music. Journalism students are just as entitled to qualified instruction as any other students in the school.

Moreover, advisers hired for their jobs stay on those jobs longer. There was a strong relationship between years of advising experience and how advisers in this study were hired ($X^2=27.14$ with 12 df, $p<.01$). More than 53 per cent of the advisers in the study with more than 10 years experience were originally hired for their jobs, more than twice the rate of appointees or volunteers. Since greater adviser experience is

associated with several autonomy characteristics, it would seem to be in the interests of scholastic journalism organizations to do what they can to encourage policies to hire as advisers teachers with appropriate backgrounds.

A fourth dimension of scholastic free expression has emerged from this study. Newspapers which take responsibility for raising for themselves the greater part of their operating budgets do seem to enjoy greater latitude in several respects than their administratively-subsidized cousins. If further investigation confirms the apparent relationship between free expression and self-funding, it will add another ingredient to the college courses and workshop sessions advisers need. Advisers usually receive little training in business practices. They are taught an assortment of writing, editing and layout skills, perhaps some computer or photography applications, legal and ethical issues, and a good deal about lesson plans and teaching methods. In the light of the evidence presented here, it seems time to make sure that journalism education classes in teacher certification programs include a strong unit in business practices and advertising sales, and that state and national associations make such adviser sessions an important part of their programs at every convention. Financial self-sufficiency is not the only route to ensuring a free and self-reliant scholastic press, of course, and is not even the most important.

But it is time for its importance to be recognized and added to the agendas of those who seek to understand the ways in which the student press can be brought to its full potential.

Overgenralization from the results of any study is usually a mistake. Although many points in this study appear clear, the information about whether stories would be killed by administrators was based on the advisers' perception of that likelihood, not on statements from administrators. Advisers might be misreading their principals' attitudes. This study also makes no differentiation among stories which would be killed by advisers because of their personal reservations about a topic's suitability and those killed because of an adviser's belief that it would be killed by the principal anyway. Finally, a more complex design allowing regression analysis could make the interactions among variables more clear. They are presented here as discrete phenomena.

But the results in this study offer an interesting and potentially fruitful addition to the research agenda in scholastic journalism and free expression. Money is a driving force in the commercial press. It should not be surprising to learn that it may also be an important dimension of the scholastic press.

TABLES

TABLE 1

Prepublication Review and Stories Not Cleared By Principals and Advisers

	Principals		Advisers	
	Read Copy Before Pub	Refused to Clear Copy	Read Copy Before Pub	Refused to Clear Copy
NEVER	44.0%	67.7%	1.0%	29.7%
RARELY	35.7	25.0	1.5	54.7
SOMETIMES	5.7	5.7	3.6	14.1
OFTEN	14.5	1.0	93.8	1.6

N=192

TABLE 2

Probable Disposition of Controversial Stories By Principals and Advisers

	Probably or definitely killed by principal	Probably or definitely killed by adviser	Story would run or has run within past year
BIRTH CONTROL	18.5%	12.2%	69.3%
ABORTION	15.3	12.7	72.0
POLITICAL ENDOR.	12.8	35.6	51.6
SCH BOARD ENDOR.	16.5	42.3	41.2
CRIT SCH BOARD	21.2	19.5	59.3
CRIT ADMINISTR	16.1	22.9	61.0
CRIT SPORTS TEAM	11.1	26.9	61.9
CRIT TEACHERS	10.4	32.3	57.3
DRUGS IN SCHOOL	9.4	4.6	85.9
SEX & PREGNANCY	7.5	6.9	85.6

TABLE 3
Percentage of Respondents Reporting
Profit and Loss at Half to Full
Advertising or Administrative Financing

	50% or more of Funding Through		100% of Funding Through	
	Advert	Admin	Advert	Admin
Made Profit	42%	11%	68%	3%
Broke Even	40%	79%	21%	84%
Lost Money	19%	11%	11%	13%

N=161

NOTES

[1]Commission of Inquiry into High School Journalism. Captive Voices. New York: Schocken Books (1974).

[2]John Bowen. Captive Voices: Another Look. Journalism Education Association report (January 1976).

[3]Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District. 89 S.Ct. 733, 393 U.S. 503 (1969).

[4]Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier, 108 S.Ct. 562 (1988).

[5]Laurence R. Campbell, "Training Sponsors for High School Journalism." Journalism Quarterly 16,4: 366-70 (December 1939).

[6]John A. Boyd. "High School Journalism Instruction in Indiana." Journalism Quarterly 37,4: 586-87 (Autumn 1960).

[7]John Pettibone. "Summer Workshops Offer Training for Nation's Publications Advisers." Quill and Scroll 44,4: 8-9 (April-May 1970).

[8]Carol K. Driscoll. First Amendment and the High School Press Adviser. Journalism Education Association report (January 1976).

[9]Articles included in this issue of the NASSP Bulletin 72:511 (November 1988) were articles by Molly Clemons, "When Will Principals Have No Need to Worry About Publications," pp. 9-10; John Bowen, "Responsibility: The Key to Scholastic Journalism," pp. 19-20; and Thomas Evislage, "Publications Guidelines: A Way to Avoid Conflict and Courtrooms," pp. 21-26. See also Lynn Shenkman, "Publications Advisers -- What Are Their Competencies, Skills?" NASSP Bulletin 68:468 (January 1984), pp. 75-78.

[10]Robert Trager and Donna L. Dickerson. "Prior Restraint in High School: Law, Attitudes and Practice." Journalism Quarterly 57:135-138 (Spring 1980).

[11]Nancy Gallinger. "Still Captive Voices? High School Journalism in New England Needs Help." Newspaper Research Journal 11,2:12-27 (Spring 1990).

[12]J. William Click and Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver. "Principals' and Newspaper Advisers' Attitudes Toward Freedom of the Student Press in the United States." Presented to the Secondary Education Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Annual Convention, Norman, Oklahoma (August 1986). By the same authors, also see

"Principals favor discipline more than a free press." Journalism Educator 43:2 (Summer 1988), pp. 48-51.

[13]For information on principals' attitudes, see Thomas V. Dickson, "Attitudes of High School Principals about Press Freedom after Hazelwood." Journalism Quarterly 66:169-173, 1989. For emphasis on advisers, and for good demographic information, see Thomas V. Dickson, "How Advisers View the Status of High School Press Freedom Following the Hazelwood Decision." Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication national convention, Washington, D.C. (August 1989).

[14]Mary Benedict. "Two Views of the High School Newspaper: A Comparative Study of the Perceptions of the Role of the High School Newspaper in Nine States." Presented to the Secondary Education Division of the Association for Education in Journalism Annual Meeting, East Lansing, Michigan (August 1981).

[15]Jack Dvorak. "High School Newspaper Financing: An Assessment." Presented to the Mid-Winter Meeting of the Secondary Education Division of the Association for Education in Journalism, Norman, Oklahoma (January 1982).

[16]Laurence B. Lain. "The Funding of Secondary School Newspapers in Ohio." Presented to the Secondary Education Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Annual Convention, Norman, Oklahoma (August 1986). Also see Laurence B. Lain. "A National Study of High School Newspaper Programs: Funding, Printing, and Advising the Paper." Presented to the mid-winter meeting of the Secondary Education Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Nashville, Tennessee (January 1992).

[17]Patterson's American Education 1990, vol. LXXXVI. Mount Prospect, IL: Educational Directories, Inc. (1989).

[18]Lain (1992).

APPENDIX
INSTRUMENT USED IN STUDY

Respondent No._____

Part I. About Your School

1. Is your school
   ___1. Public
   ___2. Private or parochial

2. Enrollment in grades 10-12 _____

3. Size of city in which school is located:
   ___1. Rural
   ___2. Under 25,000
   ___3. 25,000 to 100,000
   ___4. Over 100,000

4. Does your school publish a student newspaper?
   ___1. Yes (Please continue the questionnaire)
   ___2. No (Please stop here and return the questionnaire.)

Part II. About your Newspaper's Production

5. How often is your paper published?
   ___1. weekly
   ___2. every other week
   ___3. every three weeks
   ___4. monthly
   ___5. 2-3 times a semester
   ___6. other (_____)

6. Is the newspaper published by
   ___1. a credit-bearing class
   ___2. a non-credit class
   ___3. an extra-curricular staff
   ___4. other (_____)

7. How is your paper produced?
   ___1. Printed (offset or letterpress)
   ___2. Mimeographed (go to Question 11)
   ___3. Xerox or other photocopy
   ___4. Each copy printed individually on computer
   ___5. A school page in the local newspaper (Go to Question 11)
   ___6. not sure (Please sent a copy of your paper with this form)
   ___7. Other (_____)

8. In what phases of production does your newspaper use computers?
   Please mark all that apply.
   ___1. We do not use computers (Skip to Question 10)
   ___2. We write stories on computers
   ___3. We set type for pasteup on computers
   ___4. We compose entire pages on computers
   ___5. We use a desktop publishing system

9. Please tell us what kind of computer equipment you use:

   1. Computer brand/model:_____

   2. Word Processing software:_____

   3. Desktop Publishing Software:_____

10. Do you use any other sort of typesetting equipment?
    ___1. Yes (what?_____)
    ___2. No

III. About Your Newspaper's Finances

11. Including everything -- typesetting, photography, printing, supplies, etc. -- please estimate the total cost of publishing your paper:
$_____ ___per issue
___per year
___other (_____)

12. Please indicate what percentage of your newspaper budget comes from each of the following sources:
___% 1. share of student activity fee
___% 2. subscriptions
___% 3. single copy sales
___% 4. money from school board or administration
___% 5. advertising
___% 6. other sources (What?_____)

13. How did your newspaper finish last school year financially?
___1. We made money (How much?_____)
___2. We broke even
___3. We lost money (How much?_____)

IV. About Your Newspaper's Content

14. Does the principal or some other administrator or your school read the copy for your newspaper before publication?
___1. NO, never
___2. YES, but only when I request it
___3. YES, but rarely
___4. YES, sometimes
___5. YES, always or almost always

15. Does your principal require that any potentially controversial article be cleared by an administrator before publication?
___1. NO
___2. YES

16. Has your principal ever refused to approve an article, or insisted on a rewrite before publication?
___1. NO, never
___2. YES, but rarely
___3. YES, sometimes
___4. YES, always or almost always

17. Does the faculty adviser of the newspaper read all copy for the paper before publication?
___1. NO, never
___2. YES, but only when students request it
___3. YES, but rarely
___4. YES, sometimes
___5. YES, always or almost always

18. Has the faculty adviser ever refused to approve a controversial article for publication and insisted on a rewrite because of the article's content -- not because of mechanical reasons?
___1. NO, never
___2. YES, but rarely
___3. YES, sometimes
___4. YES, always or almost always

19. Are teachers permitted to review before publication articles about themselves or their organizations and to make changes in the articles?
___1. NO, never
___2. YES, but for factual accuracy only
___3. YES, for any content

20. What voice does the principal have in selecting the student newspaper editor?
___1. none
___2. The principal must approve the choice.
___3. The principal chooses the editor.

21-30. In your opinion, what would be the fate of articles on the following subjects if they were written by a member of your newspaper staff? Please evaluate them by subject matter only. Assume that they are otherwise well-written and researched.

21. Birth control
    ____1. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by principal
    ____2. Story would PROBABLY be killed by principal
    ____3. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by adviser
    ____4. Story would PROBABLY be killed by adviser
    ____5. Story probably would run in our paper
    ____6. Our paper has run such a story in the past year

22. Abortion
    ____1. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by principal
    ____2. Story would PROBABLY be killed by principal
    ____3. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by adviser
    ____4. Story would PROBABLY be killed by adviser
    ____5. Story probably would run in our paper
    ____6. Our paper has run such a story in the past year

23. Endorsement of a political candidate for local office.
    ____1. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by principal
    ____2. Story would PROBABLY be killed by principal
    ____3. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by adviser
    ____4. Story would PROBABLY be killed by adviser
    ____5. Story probably would run in our paper
    ____6. Our paper has run such a story in the past year

24. Endorsement of a candidate for School Board.
    ____1. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by principal
    ____2. Story would PROBABLY be killed by principal
    ____3. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by adviser
    ____4. Story would PROBABLY be killed by adviser
    ____5. Story probably would run in our paper
    ____6. Our paper has run such a story in the past year

25. Story critical of the School Board.
    ____1. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by principal
    ____2. Story would PROBABLY be killed by principal
    ____3. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by adviser
    ____4. Story would PROBABLY be killed by adviser
    ____5. Story probably would run in our paper
    ____6. Our paper has run such a story in the past year

26. A story critical of the school administration.
    ____1. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by principal
    ____2. Story would PROBABLY be killed by principal
    ____3. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by adviser
    ____4. Story would PROBABLY be killed by adviser
    ____5. Story probably would run in our paper
    ____6. Our paper has run such a story in the past year

27. A story critical of a school sports team.
    ____1. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by principal
    ____2. Story would PROBABLY be killed by principal
    ____3. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by adviser
    ____4. Story would PROBABLY be killed by adviser
    ____5. Story probably would run in our paper
    ____6. Our paper has run such a story in the past year

28. A story critical of teachers in general.
    ____1. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by principal
    ____2. Story would PROBABLY be killed by principal
    ____3. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by adviser
    ____4. Story would PROBABLY be killed by adviser
    ____5. Story probably would run in our paper
    ____6. Our paper has run such a story in the past year

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

29. A story about drug problems in your school.
___1. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by principal
___2. Story would PROBABLY be killed by principal
___3. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by adviser
___4. Story would PROBABLY be killed by adviser
___5. Story probably would run in our paper
___6. Our paper has run such a story in the past year

30. A general story about teens, sex, and pregnancy.
___1. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by principal
___2. Story would PROBABLY be killed by principal
___3. Story would DEFINITELY be killed by adviser
___4. Story would PROBABLY be killed by adviser
___5. Story probably would run in our paper
___6. Our paper has run such a story in the past year

V. About You

31. Do you receive any extra pay for serving as newspaper adviser?
___1. YES (How much per year?_____)
___2. NO

32. Do you or your staff belong to any of the following press organizations? Mark all that apply.
___1. your state high school press association
___2. Journalism Education Assn. (JEA)
___3. Columbia Scholastic Press Advisers Assn. (CSPAA)
___4. Quill and Scroll (Q&S)
___5. National Scholastic Press Assn. (NSPA)
___6. Columbia Scholastic Press Assn. (CSPA)
___7. Assn. for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication (AEJMC)
___8. Society of Professional Journalists (formerly Sigma Delta Chi)
___9. Kappa Tau Alpha journalism honorary
___10. other:_____

33. In what field in your Bachelor's degree?_____

34. If you have a Master's degree, in what field?_____

35. How did you become newspaper adviser?
___1. hired for the job
___2. assigned the job after hiring
___3. volunteered for the job after hiring
___4. rotation among faculty (It's my turn...")
___5. other:_____

36. Including this year, how many years have you been a newspaper adviser?
_____years

37. Please describe any other professional experience you've had in journalism.

38. Please rank the following issues according to how great a threat you believe them to be to the high school press. A "1" represents the greatest threat. Leave blank anything you do not consider a threat:
___a. low literacy levels
___b. limits on adviser time
___c. limits on students' free expression
___d. student apathy
___e. budget limitations
___f. other threats (_____)

Thank you for your time! If you'd like a copy of the final report (available about April 1) please include your name and address below or on another sheet of paper and I'll send you a copy. I'd also appreciate it if you'd send me a copy of your most recent issue. I've been involved with high school journalism for many years and would enjoy seeing your paper. Send copies to **Dr. Larry Lain**
Department of Communication
University of Dayton
Dayton, OH 45469-1410

ABSTRACT

A NATIONAL STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL NEWSPAPER PROGRAMS: ENVIRONMENTAL AND ADVISER CHARACTERISTICS, FUNDING AND PRESSURES ON FREE EXPRESSION

By Laurence B. Lain, Ph.D.
University of Dayton

Secondary Education Division

This paper measures certain environmental, financial, adviser and autonomy variables among high school newspaper programs nationwide. School type, size, and adviser experience are important to scholastic free expression, something which has been found in earlier studies. But this paper also suggests that finances influence publication autonomy. Papers supported through advertising were better able to run stories on birth control, abortion, sex, and stories critical of school administration. Furthermore, papers which make a profit were less likely to be screened by administrators. Profitable papers had fewer stories killed by administrators and were less likely to allow teachers to screen stories about themselves. Results suggest that journalism teachers place greater emphasis on teaching about the economics of newspapers, as well as about their editorial operations, and that advisers concerned about free expression carefully consider the role of administrative subsidies for the papers they advise.